Hosts and Guests in Participatory Development

Höckert, Emily; Kugapi, Outi; Lüthje, Monika

Published in:
The Future of Inclusive Tourism

Published: 01.01.2021

Document Version
Version created as part of publication process; publisher's layout; not normally made publicly available

Citation for pulished version (APA):
Höckert, E., Kugapi, O., & Lüthje, M. (2021). Hosts and Guests in Participatory Development. In A. Harju-Myllyaho, & S. Jutila (Eds.), *The Future of Inclusive Tourism* Channel view publications. The Future of Tourism No. 5

This is a pre-print of a published chapter in: A. Harju-Myllyaho & S. Jutila (eds.) (2021), *The future of inclusive tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications. https://www.channelviewpublications.com/page/detail/?K=9781845416867

Hosts and Guests in Participatory Development

Emily Höckert, Outi Kugapi and Monika Lüthje

Introduction

During the past decades, the idea of local participation has played an important role in the search for more sustainable, responsible and inclusive ways of developing tourism. The basic idea behind the participatory approach is to guarantee local communities' active involvement in their own development. In practice, the initiatives for inviting more tourists and enhancing tourism development quite often come from outsiders – the guests. Various examples indicate that despite, and even because of, the good intentions of enhancing inclusion and well-being, local communities tend to play the role of the guests in participatory projects hosted by researchers and development practitioners (see Höckert, 2018).

The participatory approach can be located at the core of 'inclusive tourism' and aims to ensure that marginalised groups can take part in consuming, producing and sharing the benefits of tourism activities (Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2017). In Scheyvens and Biddulph's (2017) view, the idea of inclusion consists of two basic aspects – first, who are included or excluded in tourism and, second, on what terms. These questions have been discussed in the context of inclusive business growth (Hall *et al*., 2012), accessible tourism (Buhalis & Darcy, 2011; Darcy, 2010), social tourism (Minnaert *et al*., 2011), labelling processes (de Bernardi *et al*., 2018), social justice (Aitchison, 2007; Jamal, 2019), social entrepreneurship (Haanpää *et al*., 2018) and digitalism (Minghetti & Buhalis, 2010). While searching for new ways to enhance inclusive tourism practices, these studies underline the importance of participating in tourism activities based on one's own conditions, needs and interests (de Bernardi *et al*., 2018; George *et al*., 2009; Höckert, 2018; Jamal & Dredge, 2014: 195–197; Müller & Viken, 2017; Schilcher, 2007: 59). In other words, the idea of inclusive and participatory tourism development should also contain the possibility of free choice to not participate; that is, to remain 'excluded' from tourism projects.

As a concept, *project* emphasises agency, plan, objectives, volition and accomplishment (Rantala & Sulkunen, 2006a: 8–9). Participation in projects is organised through collaboration, partnerships and agreements that structure the relationships of various project participants and are

based on voluntary and mutual commitment, negotiations and trust (Sulkunen, 2006: 17–18; see also Lundin, 2016; Ren et al 2018, 181). However, one of the persistent challenges in today's 'project society' (e.g. Lundin, 2016; Sulkunen, 2006), where strategies and financing for participation often come from external actors, is what happens when the support ends and the projects are handed on to local stakeholders (see Zapata *et al*., 2011). 'The project' can also be seen as a neoliberal solution where individuals are expected to develop innovative and entrepreneurial solutions to structural problems (Rantala & Sulkunen, 2006b; Sulkunen, 2006; see also Lundin, 2016). Indeed, critical examinations of community-based projects indicate how the principle of participation does not automatically lead to more equal power relations between different actors (Butcher, 2007; Höckert, 2018; Wearing & Wearing, 2014). It seems that, despite the good intentions of enhancing people's ownership in their own well-being, the 'project society' is in constant need of structural changes and tuning in order to secure partners' commitment and ownership within participatory projects.

The purpose of this chapter is to approach inclusion by discussing the roles of hosts and guests in participatory tourism projects. Instead of drawing inspiration from the predominant understanding of host–guest relations within hospitality management (see Lashley, 2017), we call attention to the more 'ancient' idea of hospitality, where – in its simplest form – hosts have the responsibility to take care of their guests' well-being for a limited amount of time (O'Gorman, 2010). Moreover, in the context of 'project society', we are not focused on host–guest relations that take place in different kinds of physical homes, but approach projects as metaphorical homes where different kinds of moments and relations of hospitality occur (see Germann Molz & Gibson, 2007; Höckert, 2018).

Instead of celebrating all the participants as 'the hosts', we draw explicit attention to structural challenges of our project worlds and to the ways in which the host–guest roles keep changing during the project processes. To visualise and demonstrate our approach in practical terms, we wrote this chapter side by side with a development project called Culturally Sensitive Tourism in the Arctic (ARCTISEN). Our aim was to weave together the literature on participatory development and hospitality with our own experiences in preparing this project. In addition to our reflective memory work, the analysis draws on a wide range of documentation from the preparatory phase, such as meeting memos, email correspondence, and reports and documents from the funding authority.

Preparation of the ARCTISEN project was driven by our interest to enable small and medium-size tourism enterprises to visit and learn from each other and to co-create culturally sensitive tourism products (ARCTISEN, 2018). The very first step of our project journey was taken in 2015, when Monika Lüthje proposed the idea of an Indigenous tourism project to the rest of us. From the very first stages, she opened the door for shared hostessing (see also Veijola & Jokinen, 2008) of all the new ideas that began to arrive. We decided to apply for funding from the EU's Northern Periphery and Arctic Programme (NPA, 2018). During the preparatory phase of the ARCTISEN project, our role

was to learn and follow the conditions set by our NPA 'host'. We acknowledge that our affiliation with the University of Lapland made us look like mature guests with a well-established reputation for being able to 'follow the rules' (Germann Molz, 2014; Lundin, 2016). Nevertheless, while being the guest knocking on NPA's doors, our university team was also taking on the role of the host, who began to welcome tourism entrepreneurs, destination management organisations (DMOs), non-governmental organisations (NGOs), municipalities and other university partners to join the preparation phase of the project. By doing this, we wished to form a new 'tourism knowledge collective' (Ren & Jóhannesson 2018: 24): a gathering around culturally sensitive tourism.

The next section guides the reader along the streams of discussions on participatory development within *tourism studies*. From there, we move to our theoretical take on host–guest relations. The next section describes how we then laid our hopes on the NPA as the host for our transnational project idea. In the final section, we conclude this chapter and suggest that the idea of hosts and guests can be used as a fruitful approach when envisioning and promoting alternative, more inclusive, sensitive and responsible tourism futures.

Participatory Development in Tourism

While the history of 'participation' – of being, doing and knowing together – is as old as humanity, it has become both a keyword and a buzzword in the contemporary search for sustainable development (Berkhöfer & Berkhöfer, 2007; Cornwall, 2006; Stiefel & Wolfe 1994). Originally, the emphasis on active local participation emerged as a response to the numerous tourism impact studies and resident attitude surveys, which indicated that few positive impacts accrued to host communities (Cohen, 1979; Keogh, 1990: 450; Tosun, 2000: 616). In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the tourism sector was still marked by little public involvement in tourism planning and it was noticed that public concerns should be incorporated into decision-making processes (de Kadt, 1979; Mathieson & Wall, 1982). Ever since, the idea of local participation has been connected, most of all, to small-scale tourism development that uses cultural and environmental resources in responsible and sustainable ways (Jamal & Getz, 1995; Scheyvens, 2002; Tuulentie & Sarkki, 2009).

Researchers have since been formulating alternative development approaches, such as *community-based tourism*, which focuses on the well-being of local host communities (see Höckert, 2011; Höckert *et al*., 2013; Jamal & Dredge, 2014; Saarinen, 2006, 2010; Telfer, 2009; Tuulentie & Sarkki, 2009). The term *Indigenous tourism* has also been seen as a form of tourism that actively involves Indigenous communities in activities and decision-making and/or acting as an attraction of the area (Hinch & Butler, 1997: 9; Hinch & Butler, 2009: Müller & Viken, 2017; see also Kugapi & de Bernardi, 2017). It has been argued that, for many Indigenous people, tourism is an opportunity to

earn extra income, show others part of their culture, disseminate knowledge (Tuulentie, 2006) and gain community control and ownership of tourism. Good examples of previous projects in tourism that have been planned and led by Indigenous and other local communities include the cultural and environmental *Sápmi Experience* that was created by VisitSápmi in Sweden (see de Bernardi *et al*., 2018) and the guidelines for responsible and ethically sustainable Sámi Tourism produced by the Sámi Parliament (2018) in Finland.

In recent decades, a growing number of governments and international development agencies have come to recognise the important role of local-level organisations and local-level knowledge. As a result, the participatory discourse has played an important role in the language used in project plans. Simultaneously, Jim Butcher (2007) and other tourism scholars presented sharp critiques towards participatory tourism projects run by NGOs and aid agencies. Butcher (2007) argues that while community participation is often associated with a progressive democratic approach, communities are invited to participate only to implement pre-planned projects rather than in shaping the development goals and agendas behind them; this is especially true for Indigenous communities who are often seen as 'targets rather than as agents of development' in tourism projects (Müller & Viken, 2017: 7). Moreover, critical voices within tourism studies have also drawn attention to the negative influences of participatory tourism development, such as problems in achieving the goal of benefit delivery, aggravating and creating internal conflicts and jealousies, and promoting unrealistic expectations (Hinch & Butler, 1996; Müller & Viken, 2017; Swarbrooke, 2002; Tosun, 2000; Warnholz & Barkin, 2018).

The failure of supposedly participatory projects has been explained by top-down approaches that overlook local contexts and local knowledge. In these kinds of projects, external actors – the guests – arrive in communities with ready-made plans and ideas on how the local actors should participate in their own development (see Höckert, 2018; Jamal & Dredge, 2014). As an alternative to top-down methods, bottom-up strategies place emphasis on ownership and empowerment that can lead to social, economic, psychological and political change (Arai, 1996; Scheyvens, 1999; 2002; 2003; Telfer & Sharpley, 2008: 130). Wearing and Wearing (2014) approach the issue of moral encounters in ecotourism from a feminist post-colonial perspective, which directs attention to the inequalities and intersections of gender, race and socioeconomic positions within host communities. The conceptualisation of empowerment has been used in research that focuses on the issues of gender equality (Hashimoto, 2014: 223–225; Miettinen, 2007) and Indigenous issues (de Bernardi *et al*., 2018; Nicholas & Thapa, 2018), in the context of tourism development. It has been argued that external contacts, self-esteem, pride and confidence can have a positive influence on empowerment, whereas a lack of knowledge about tourism, a lack of self-confidence or a lack of skills might lead to disempowerment even though people are seemingly participating in tourism development (de Bernardi *et al*., 2018; Höckert, 2011).

In recent years, an increasing amount of post-development literature has questioned the dominance of Eurocentric worldviews on development and called for the inclusion of multiple worldviews and ways of understanding tourism and development in general (Telfer, 2009). Therefore, the notions of *local* and *Indigenous knowledge* have become commonly used concepts within the participatory tourism discourse (Jamal *et al*., 2003: 154; Prasetyo *et al*., 2019: 14; Telfer, 2009: 153; Zapata *et al*., 2011: 23). What much of the previous studies seem to agree on is how local stakeholders hold essential knowledge (Lee & Jan, 2019; Lundberg, 2015; Tanga & Maliehe, 2011; see also Kaján, 2014) that should be included in tourism development from the early stages (Lee & Jan, 2019). Nevertheless, while some researchers call for more careful attention to local knowledge (Koster *et al*., 2012), others argue that local communities are often lacking the needed knowledge and are thus seriously hindered from participating in planning and developing tourism (see Moscardo, 2008; Warnholz & Barkin, 2018). For instance, Tosun (2000: 630) has suggested that difficulties can be explained by '…cultural remoteness of host communities to tourism-related businesses in developing countries…' or local communities' unawareness of tourism markets. At the same time, Hakkarainen (2017) and Höckert (2018) have drawn attention to local actors' limited time and other resources to participate in project activities outside of their usual daily routines. In their view, this challenge has been overlooked in both research and practice.

Despite the critique and scepticism, development scholars encourage others to be careful not to throw the baby out with the bathwater and discard the idea of participation as such (e.g. Hickey & Mohan, 2004; Leal, 2010: 77). For instance, in participatory scholar Leal's view, there exists a need to return to alternative constructs of 'the good life' (Leal, 2010: 79). In an extensive critique of the participatory 'orthodox' in tourism studies, Butcher (2007: 61) laments that even the comprehensive critical studies tend to focus on operationalising the concept of community participation rather than on the concept itself. Butcher (2012: 103) argues, similar to Wearing and Wearing (2014), that studies on local participation are often misleadingly focused only on inclusion inside the local communities and not the power relations beyond the community level. Despite the many participatory development and research projects, there has been little reflection about the value premises that shape our opinions of ideal forms of participation and development as such. For us, one of the consequences of the extensive focus on methodological packages and techniques is that the conceptualisation of community participation has lost its connections to previous theories of community development and participation, and participation has lost its philosophical meanings (Leal, 2010; see also Dredge *et al*., 2013; Jamal & Stronza, 2008).

On Hosts and Guests

Previous and existing challenges in participatory projects encourage looking for novel ways of thinking about tourism development to take into consideration a wider range of stakeholders and to sensitise ourselves towards Indigenous and other local cultures. During recent years, we have become

convinced about the fruitfulness of approaching participatory development in terms of host–guest relations. This means, in its simplest form, replacing the goal-driven and growth-driven ideas of participation with a call for openness and reciprocity between hosts and guests (Germann Molz & Gibson, 2007; Höckert, 2018; Keen & Tucker, 2012: 97). The idea of reciprocity between hosts and guests can be understood not only as a ritual of exchanging gifts, but also as a more fundamental care relationship, where both hosts and guests take care for each other's well-being (see Länsman, 2004; Lashley, 2000; Pyyhtinen, 2014; Telfer, 2000).

In ancient stories, hospitality was described as the virtue of opening one's home to a stranger who arrives at the door (O'Gorman, 2010). This refers to the responsibility of welcoming and taking care of the one in need. Hence, the idea of hospitality simultaneously includes the call for openness towards strangers and the responsibility to offer them what they might need. However, the responsibility to take care of one's guests came with no guarantee that the surprise guest would be able to 'pay back' the hospitality of the host. The only thing that could be expected from this guest, as Immanuel Kant (1996 [1795]) later described, was not to take advantage of or abuse the host's hospitality.

The notion of hospitality has gained attention in recent years based on the growing mobility of migrants, asylum seekers, tourists, commodities and so on (Lynch *et al*., 2011). Today's tourism industries have turned hospitality into a profitable business, where the idea of reciprocity means that 'guests' pay for the hospitality services that their 'hosts' offer (see Smith, 1977). While this aspect of hospitality has taken over a big part of tourism research and education, our theoretical idea of hospitality builds on the philosophies of hospitality where the focus is on the questions of ethics, responsibility and care among hosts and guests (Germann Molz & Gibson, 2007; Höckert, 2018; Lynch *et al*., 2011; Veijola *et al*., 2014). These streams of discussions share the idea of keeping the roles of hosts and guests on the move (see Derrida, 1999; Levinas, 1969), reflecting upon the ways in which we are constantly both hosts and guests in our relations with others. What makes this approach especially fruitful is the way in which this kind of hospitality – read participation – can never be completely regulated or pre-planned; instead, it is continuously negotiated in the encounters between self and other (Höckert, 2018).

In a recent analysis, Tucker (2014: 199) points to the need for moving away from the 'assumptions of fixed cultural positions in tourism encounters, and towards focusing on the fluidity and mobility of positions and relation between so-called "tourists" and "toured"' hosts and guests. In our view, this paradigm shift is essential as it places the focus on the contradictions and ambiguities of different tourism encounters. Saying this, we suggest here that the notion of hospitality and the idea of caring relationships between hosts and guests can help us to reflect different ways of thinking, doing and accomplishing participatory development (see Höckert, 2018). As proposed by Levinas (1969), hospitality boils down to the idea of being ready for surprises and keeping the door open to the unexpected. Along these lines, we see that participatory development cannot be pre-designed, but

must remain open to other ways of being, doing and knowing. Moreover, and still following Levinas' radical thought, instead of trying to preserve our roles as hosts of participatory projects, we must be ready to let others take on the role of the hosts; that is, being a guest is supposed to be a temporary position as it would be unbearable to always be in the role of a guest needing to follow the conditions and 'house rules' of one's host. Therefore, we suggest here that participatory projects should strive for reciprocal relations, where the roles of hosts and guests are constantly changing.

This is something that we wish to demonstrate in the following section and to introduce an alternative way of approaching subjectivity and agency in participatory projects.

Hosts and Guests in the ARCTISEN Project

The idea for the ARCTISEN project grew out of concerns about the exploitation of Sámi and other Indigenous cultures in the middle of an expansive growth in tourism beginning in 2015. While acknowledging previous Sámi tourism development projects in the area, the need for a more comprehensive, international project was supported by previous research on Indigenous Sámi tourism in northern Norway, Sweden and Finland and the Kola Peninsula in Russia (e.g. de Bernardi *et al*., 2018; Lüthje, 1998; Müller & Huuva, 2009; Müller & Pettersson, 2006; Niskala & Ridanpää, 2016; Viken & Müller, 2017). The starting point for ARCTISEN was to compare current situations across the borders, learn from others and develop something new, while the project participants, at the same time, become more powerful against the exploiting tourism industry. With a large, participatory project in mind, we began the preparatory phase to apply for project funding from the NPA.

The NPA is an EU development programme with the vision to 'generate vibrant, competitive and sustainable communities, by harnessing innovation, expanding the capacity for entrepreneurship and seizing the unique growth initiatives and opportunities of the Northern and Arctic regions in a resource efficient way' (NPA, 2018: 2). The NPA makes open, public calls for project proposals to act as hosts who invite guests (read project applicants) to suggest what kind of development projects should take place in the programme area (Finland, Sweden, Norway, Iceland, Greenland, Faroe Islands, Ireland, Northern Ireland and the United Kingdom) within the frame of its development programme. The NPA offers the possibility to apply for funding to prepare the actual (main) project application. We received preparatory funding in May 2016, which allowed us to welcome and include more stakeholders to co-plan the project.

The initial idea was to have a Sámi tourism project including Finland, Sweden and Norway. However, to fulfil the requirements of our host, the NPA, we had to enlarge our project to a more transnational one. The NPA recommended that we invite more partners to join our project, such as the World Indigenous Tourism Alliance and tourism organisations in Greenland and Canada. We aimed at a project with several kinds of partners – universities, business development agencies, small and medium-size enterprises, DMOs and NGOs. We, at the University of Lapland, as a lead partner, acted as a host and invited the previously mentioned organisations to participate and contribute to the

project preparation as our guests. Our main criteria was to find guests who were sharing our concerns about the cultural insensitivity of current tourism development in the Arctic. While our focus was on the responsible use of cultures in tourism settings, we chose to make the project more inclusive by speaking of *culturally sensitive tourism* rather than *Indigenous tourism.* We defined culturally sensitive tourism as tourism that enhances stakeholders' self-determination, intra- and intercultural understanding, respect, empowerment and inclusion together with economic development.

What is important to acknowledge here is that the NPA encourages projects to invite two different kinds of partners – full partners and associated partners. Full partners receive funding from the NPA for project implementation; they participate in project funding with their own contribution and are responsible for project activities and reporting. Interestingly, only a community that is a legal entity – an organisation – can be a project partner in NPA projects, not, for example, a community formed by local people without membership in a formal organisation. In addition, while associated partners do not receive funding from the NPA or participate in project funding or reporting, they can participate in project activities and get their project costs covered from the project budgets of the full partners. This makes it possible for smaller organisations with limited resources to participate in ARCTISEN as associated partners. However, while the different kinds of partnerships enable a wider range of actors to join and participate in project activities, this structure excludes the smaller associated partners from project management and decision-making processes, resulting in unequal power relations within the project.

The aim of the ARCTISEN project was to find and develop solutions for the different needs of small and medium-size tourism enterprises in the Arctic. We aligned ourselves with the idea of pioneering tourism researcher Emmanuel de Kadt that 'for community interests to be taken into account in tourism (or any other) development, it is essential that those interests be articulated from the moment potential projects are identified' (de Kadt, 1979: 134). Moreover, we took seriously the aforementioned criticisms of Butcher *et al*. (2012: 118) towards the paradoxes within the participatory tourism paradigm and the misuse of participatory rhetoric. We aimed to be responsible and respectful hosts when we arranged interviews and discussions with local stakeholders, respecting their rhythms, timelines and interests. While we invited these actors to join the project planning, we were simultaneously guests who were entering their premises – thus making them the hosts.

During the discussions, our aim was to learn about the challenges, possibilities and needs of development that the local stakeholders currently faced in tourism (see Kaján, 2014; Lee & Jan, 2019; Lundberg, 2015; Tanga & Maliehe, 2011). We also discussed what kind of project they would like to have and what activities to include. Hall (2003: 100) suggested that tourism planners have the task of finding agreement between various stakeholders and interests in tourism development – and that we aimed to do. At the same time, we invited the stakeholders to participate in the project proposal as project partners and become co-hosts instead of guests. And this also happened: the organisations we invited as project partners invited new partners to the project – partners they deemed relevant.

Along the NPA's horizontal principle of inclusion and diversity (NPA, 2018: 10), we decided to keep the 'project home' open to everybody interested in culturally sensitive tourism development. We also wanted to plan the project so that the project activities were not only for the project partners, but others interested in them may also participate. Planning the project together with a large number of different kinds of stakeholders was a learning process for all of us (e.g. Grimwood *et al*., 2012; Koster *et al*., 2012). In line with the idea of hospitable forms of participation, the project plan became quite different from our initial ideas. This was not solely due to our discussions with the stakeholders and input from our project partners, but also because of the requirements of the NPA concerning the objectives, structure, contents and partners of the project.

After an extensive preparatory phase, we received both disappointing and encouraging news: while our first project proposal was not approved, the NPA encouraged us to modify our application and re-apply for funding. According to the NPA, one of the many challenges with the proposal was the high number of project partners, which would have made the project difficult to manage – it seemed like we had been too inclusive and welcoming during the process, and we were hence urged to cut down the number of project partners. This happened quite organically: while preparing the second draft of the project plan, some of the former project partners decided to drop out due to lack of staff and/or financial resources. NPA project partners have to cover part of the project costs themselves; this is normally done by allocating working hours of permanent staff to the project, which that can be a scarce resource. Preparation of the ARCTISEN project proposal took a lot of time and effort, and required the skills and prior experience of EU projects. In our view, it seems that only large organisations have the capacity to prepare this type of transnational project proposal. It also has to be said that, without the preparatory project funding, our university would not have been able to invest so much labour in the project planning and we would not have been able to involve so many stakeholders in the project preparation as we now could.

Interestingly, the possibility of choosing *not* to participate in tourism development is rarely discussed in the academic debates on local participation in tourism. While the participatory tourism literature takes for granted communities' interest in participating, Schilcher (2007: 59) and Jamal and Dredge (2014: 195–197) (also see Butcher, 2007; 2012: 104; George *et al*., 2009; Jamal & Stronza, 2009) are among the few authors who have brought up the question of whether people can choose not to participate in tourism development. In other words, this means accepting that tourism is not always perceived as an activity that adds to the general well-being of local communities – or to particular individuals' well-being within those communities. The core of Hinch and Butler's (1997) definition of Indigenous tourism is that Indigenous communities should have the opportunity to choose whether they want to be involved in tourism and how they want to be involved (see Müller & Viken, 2017). In our case, all the stakeholders invited to participate in the project were those who already participated in tourism development. However, we do not know how many of them did not become our project partners because culturally sensitive tourism was not the kind of tourism they wanted to develop or

because we (or the NPA) were not the kind of hosts with whom they would have liked to develop it. In any case, all those invited had the freedom to choose whether to participate in the project or not. We respected those decisions and did not ask for explanations.

The second version of our application was approved, which enabled us to start with the actual ARCTISEN project in October 2018. The inclusion principle of the NPA, the different partnership forms and the preparatory funding offered by the programme – as well as keeping the roles of hosts and guests changing – allowed us to prepare a project that includes various kinds of engaged stakeholders as partners and is based on stakeholder needs (although we were constrained by various administrative/practical matters stemming from the funding programme and the partner or other stakeholder organisations).

Swarbrooke (2002: 128) noted that, as community involvement in tourism planning can slow down and add costs to tourism planning, it can lead to faster top-down strategies. However, one commonly identified problem in community-based tourism projects is that the development brokers or tour operators might enter rural areas without prior understanding of the local realities or, for instance, the interconnection between tourism and community development (Wearing & McDonald, 2002). In practice, this has led to the implementation of participatory projects in which local communities are not properly informed about what they are participating in and what impacts their participation may have (Sammels, 2014). We agree. The participatory approach requires resources – time, money, people and cultural sensitiveness, among others.

To avoid these problems, we planned the first phase of the project to be a research phase involving interviewing project stakeholders to further improve our understanding of their challenges, development needs, visions and wishes concerning the project. The rest of the planned project activities were based on this information, many of them co-created together with the stakeholders participating in the project. However, the project activities must be congruent with the plan we presented in the project application. From a participatory perspective, we find this problematic, especially in the rapidly changing tourism business where new challenges and development needs may be unanticipated. This is a constraint we have to negotiate with the NPA during the project implementation phase to keep the project up-to-date and inclusive.

Towards Inclusive Project Futures

The purpose of this chapter was to rethink the idea of enhancing inclusive tourism development through participatory tourism projects. We have suggested here that the notions of hosts and guests can offer an alternative way of understanding the pitfalls and possibilities of initiatives that aim at giving voice to a wide range of tourism stakeholders. Keeping the roles of hosts and guests constantly changing in participatory project preparation and implementation may result in more inclusive development projects. Therefore, we suggest that participation in project development can

be thought as taking the roles of hosts and guests who care for each other's well-being through the project process – and even after (see Ren & Jóhannesson 2018).

We have argued that the idea of participation meets many practical constraints and limitations that must be taken into account to enable genuine inclusion, involvement and engagement (e.g. Hall, 2003; Scheyvens, 2011). While entrepreneurs and other tourism stakeholders have only limited time and other resources (Hakkarainen, 2017; Höckert, 2018), participation – as host and/or guest – requires resources and meeting various conditions set by the funding bodies. Nevertheless, we hope to avoid the unfruitful either–or debate on whether or not we should do participatory projects or whether or not local communities should be included in tourism development. In our view, this kind of discourse should be avoided as it keeps constructing an illusion of local participation as something decided and controlled by outsiders – as if participation and inclusion were something that could be initiated or stopped merely by external experts.

Although there is consensus among tourism scholars that tourism and development brokers play a significant role in participatory tourism projects (e.g. Cheong & Miller, 2000; van der Duim *et al*., 2006), opinions about the responsibilities of these development intermediaries vary greatly. In addition to distributing financial support to participants, project workers should also provide technical assistance, capacity building and possibilities for networking (see Miettinen, 2007; Wearing & McDonald, 2002; Wearing & Wearing, 2014). While planning and preparing for the ARCTISEN project, we aimed at creating a 'project community' in which the roles of teachers and learners, hosts and guests would be fluid and constantly changing. Indeed, project type development can be thought of in terms of formulating temporary communities of hosts and guests. However, instead of trying to simplify project or local communities we should see them (us) as inevitably complex and diffuse, and continuously on the move (see Cole 2006: 95; Veijola *et al*., 2014).

In this chapter, we have considered projects as things that can never be completely regulated or pre-planned but continuously negotiated in the encounters between self and other (see Höckert, 2018). To re-think the relations between tourism experts and different kinds of tourism stakeholders, we suggest questioning goal-driven ideas of participation and call for new spaces for more mobile and hybrid subject positions (Höckert, 2018; Keen & Tucker 2012: 97; Tucker, 2014). Saying this requires the deconstruction of assumed or pre-defined roles of hosts and guests, teachers and learners in participatory development (for the notion of post-host–guest society, see Veijola and Jokinen (2008)). Moreover, we aimed to challenge the idea that project workers alone have the role of the hosts, responsible for planning and arranging the 'best party' ever.

While imagining more hospitable and innovative ways of doing development, we have drawn attention to the challenges of hospitable projects within the prevailing project funding systems – with precise plans and measurable outputs. As shown by the example of our preparation for the ARCTISEN project, funding schemes can both enable and constrain inclusion in development projects. In our case, the preparatory project funding as well as the possibility to include associate

partners in the project and offer project activities to others than the project partners made the project more participatory and inclusive. At the same time, only formal organisations were accepted as project partners and, in order to receive funding, they had to contribute their own resources to the project as well. Are these constraints necessary? Could we imagine an alternative kind of project society?

While writing the last lines of this chapter, the ARCTISEN project has already been running for a year. At this point, we are co-hosting the project with other partners who seem to have strong engagement and ownership in the project. The hosting and guesting of the project activities has been shared among the project partners and a wide range of other tourism stakeholders in a way that could not be completely pre-planned or anticipated. Instead of expecting that all the doors would be open or opened for us, we are committed to continue culturally sensitive negotiations with a wide range of hosts and guests.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to all the small and medium-size enterprises, municipalities, DMOs and others who believed in the ARCTISEN project idea and participated in developing it further. We also want to express our gratitude to all our colleagues at the University of Lapland and other institutes and organisations who contributed to construction of the project's foundations over the years. Not least of which, we wish to thank the people within the NPA for being supportive in their hosting and the referees who commented on our chapter. Thank you!

References

Aitchison, C.C. (2007) Marking difference or making a difference: Constructing places, policies and knowledge of inclusion, exclusion and social justice in leisure, sport and tourism. In I. Ateljevic, A. Pritchard and N. Morgan (eds) *The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies: Innovative Research Methodologies* (pp. 77–90). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Arai, S. (1996) Benefits of citizen participation in a healthy communities initiative: Linking community development and empowerment. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research* 21, 25–44.

ARCTISEN (2018) See http://sensitivetourism.interreg-npa.eu/ (accessed March 2020).

Berkhöfer, U. and Berkhöfer, A. (2007) 'Participation' in development thinking – Coming to grips with a truism and its critiques. In S. Stoll-Kleemann and M. Welp (eds) *Stakeholder Dialogues in Natural Resource Management: Theory and Practice* (pp. 79–116). London: Springer.

Buhalis, D. and Darcy, S. (eds) (2011) *Accessible Tourism, Concepts and Issues*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Butcher, J. (2007) *Ecotourism, NGOs and Development*. London: Routledge.

Butcher, J. (2012) The mantra of 'community participation' in context. In T.V. Singh (ed.) *Critical Debates in Tourism* (pp. 102–108). Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Butcher, J., Weaver, D. and Singh, S. (2012) Does community participation empower local people? In T.V. Singh (ed.) *Critical Debates in Tourism* (pp. 101–121). Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Cheong, S. and Miller, M. (2000) Power and tourism: A Focauldian observation. *Annals of Tourism Research* 27 (2), 371–390.

Cohen, E. (1979) A phenomenology of tourist experiences. *Sociology* 13 (2), 179–201.

Cole, S. (2006) Cultural tourism, community participation and empowerment. In M.K. Smith and M. Robinson (eds) *Cultural Tourism in a Changing World. Politics, Participation and (Re)presentation* (pp. 89–103). Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Cornwall, A. (2006) Historical perspectives on participation in development. *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics* 44 (1), 27–43.

Darcy, S. (2010) Inherent complexity: Disability, accessible tourism and accommodation information preferences. *Tourism Management* 31 (6), 816–826.

de Bernardi, C., Kugapi, O. and Lüthje, M. (2018) Sámi indigenous tourism empowerment in the Nordic countries through labelling systems. Strengthening ethnic enterprises and activities. In I.B. de Lima and V. King (eds) *Tourism and Ethnodevelopment. Inclusion, Empowerment and Self-determination* (pp. 200–212). Abingdon: Routledge.

de Kadt, E. (1979) *Tourism, Passport to Development?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Derrida, J. (1999) *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*, translated by P.A. Brault and M. Naas. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press

Dredge, D., Hales, R. and Jamal, T. (2013) Community case study research: Researcher operacy, embeddedness and making research matter. *Tourism Analysis* 18 (1), 29–43.

George, E.W, Mair H. and Reid, D.G. (2009) *Rural Tourism Development Localism and Cultural Change*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Germann Molz, J. (2014) Camping in clearing. In S. Veijola, J. Germann Molz, O. Pyyhtinen, E. Höckert and A. Grit (eds) *Disruptive Tourism and its Untidy Guests. Alternative Ontologies for Future Hospitalities* (pp. 19–41). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Germann Molz, J. and Gibson, S. (2007) Introduction: Mobilizing and mooring hospitality. In J. Germann Molz and S. Gibson (eds) *Mobilizing Hospitality. The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World* (pp. 1–26). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Grimwood, B.S.R., Doubleday, N.C., Ljubicic, G.J., Donaldson S.G. and Blangy, S. (2012) Engaged acclimatization: Towards responsible community-based participatory research in Nunavut. *The Canadian Geographer* 56 (2), 211–230.

Haanpää, M., Hakkarainen, M. and Harju-Myllyaho, A. (2018) Katsaus yhteiskunnalliseen yrittäjyyteen matkailussa: osallisuuden mahdollisuudet pohjoisen urbaaneissa

paikallisyhteisöissä (Review of social entrepreneurship in tourism: possibilities of participation in the Northern urban communities). *The Finnish Journal of Tourism Research* 14 (2), 44–58.

Hakkarainen, M. (2017) Matkailutyön ehdot syrjäisessä kylässä (The conditions of tourism work in a remote village) Acta Universitatis Lapponiensis 357, Rovaniemi: Lapland University Press.

Hall, J., Matos, S., Sheehan, L. and Silvestre, B. (2012) Entrepreneurship and innovation at the base of the pyramid: A recipe for inclusive growth or social exclusion? *Journal of Management Studies, 49(4), 785-812.*

Hall, M.C. (2003) Politics and place: An analysis of power in tourism communities. In T. Singh, J.T. Dallen and R.K. Dowling (eds) *Tourism in Destination Communities* (pp. 99–114). Wallingford: CABI Publishing.

Hashimoto, A. (2014) Tourism and socio-cultural development issues. In R. Sharpley and D.J. Telfer (eds) *Tourism and Development, Concepts and Issues* (2nd edn) (pp. 205–236). Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Hickey, S. and Mohan, G. (eds) (2004) *Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation?* New York, NY: Zed Books.

Hinch, T. and Butler, R. (1996) Indigenous tourism: a common ground for discussion. In R. Butler and T. Hinch (eds) *Tourism and Indigenous Peoples* (pp. 3–19). London: International Thomson Publishing.

Hinch, T. and Butler, R. (2009) Indigenous tourism. *Tourism Analysis* 14 (1), 15–27.

Höckert, E. (2011) Community-based tourism in Nicaragua: A socio-cultural perspective. *The Finnish Journal of Tourism Research* 7 (2), 7–25.

Höckert, E. (2018) *Negotiating Hospitality: Ethics of Tourism Development in the Nicaraguan Highlands*. London: Routledge.

Höckert, E., Hakkarainen, M. and Jänis, J. (2013) Matkailun paikallinen kehittäminen maaseudulla (Participatory tourism development in rural areas). In S. Veijola (ed.) *Matkailututkimuksen lukukirja* (pp. 160–172). Rovaniemi: Lapin Yliopistokustannus.

Jamal, T. (2019) *Justice and Ethics in Tourism*. London: Earthscan.

Jamal, T. and Dredge, D. (2014) Tourism and community development issues. In R. Sharpley and D. Telfer (eds) *Tourism and Development: Concepts and Issues* (2nd edn) (pp. 178–204). London: Channel View Publications.

Jamal, T. and Getz, D. (1995) Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research* 22 (1), 186–204.

Jamal, T. and Stronza, A. (2008) "Dwelling" with ecotourism in the Peruvian Amazon: Cultural relationships in local-global spaces. *Tourist Studies* 8 (3), 313–336.

Jamal, T., Everett, J. and Dann, G. (2003) Ecological rationalization and performative resistance in natural area destinations. *Tourist Studies* 3 (2), 143–169.

Kant, I. (1996 [1795]) Toward perpetual peace: a philosophical project. In M.J. Gregor (transl.) *Practical Philosophy: The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaján, E. (2014) Community perceptions to place attachment and tourism development in Finnish Lapland. *Tourism Geographies* 16 (3), 490–511, doi:10.1080/14616688.2014.941916.

Keen, D. and Tucker, H. (2012) Future spaces of postcolonialism in tourism. In J. Wilson (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Tourism Geographies* (pp. 97–102). London: Routledge .

Keogh, B. (1990) Public participation in community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research* 17, 449–465.

Koster, R., Baccar, K. and Lemelin, H. (2012) Moving from research ON, to research WITH and FOR Indigenous communities: A critical reflection on community-based participatory research. *The Canadian Geographer* 56 (2), 195–210, doi:10.1111/j.1541-0064.2012.00428.

Kugapi, O. and de Bernardi, C. (2017) Alkuperäiskansamatkailu (Indigenous tourism). In J. Edelheim and H. Ilola (eds) *Matkailututkimuksen avainkäsitteet* (*Key Concepts in Tourism Research*) (pp. 70–75). Rovaniemi: Lapland University Press.

Länsman, A.S. (2004) *Väärtisuhteet Lapin Matkailussa. Kulttuurianalyysi suomalaisten ja saamelaisten kohtaamisesta* (*Host–Guest Relations in Tourism in Sápmi*). Oulu: Kustannus-Puntsi.

Lashley, C. (2017) Introduction. Research on hospitality: the story so far/ways on knowing hospitality. In C. Lashley (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Hospitality Studies* (pp. 17–26). Abingdon: Routledge.

Lashley, C. (2000) Towards a theoretical understanding. In C. Lashley and A. Morrison (eds) *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates* (pp. 1–17). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Leal, P.A. (2010) Participation: the ascendancy of a buzzword in the neo-liberal era. In A. Cornwall and D. Eade (eds) *Deconstructing Development Discourse. Buzzwords and Fuzzwords* (pp. 539–548). Oxford: Oxfam GB.

Lee, T.H. and Jan, F.-H. (2019) Can community-based tourism contribute to sustainable development? Evidence from residents' perceptions of the sustainability. *Tourism Management* 70, 368–380, doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2018.09.003.

Levinas, E. (1969) *Totality and Infinity. An Essay of Exteriority*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Lundberg, E. (2015) The level of tourism development and resident attitudes: A comparative case study of coastal destinations. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 15 (3), 266–294, doi:10.1080/15022250.2015.1005335.

Lundin, R. (2016) Project society: Paths and challenges. *Project Management Journal* 47 (4), 7–15.

Lüthje, M. (1998) The impacts of tourism on Saami domicile area from the point of view of carrying capacity and Saami culture of the area. In S. Aho, H. Ilola and J. Järviluoma (eds) *Dynamic Aspects in Tourism Development. Proceedings of the 5th Nordic Symposium on Tourism Research* (Vol. 1 pp. 31–46). Rovaniemi: University of Lapland Press.

Lynch, P., Germann Molz, J., McIntosh, A., Lugosi P. and Lashley, P. (2011) Theorizing Hospitality, Editorial in Hospitality & Society. 1:1, 3–24.

Mathieson, A. and Wall, G. (1982) *Tourism: Economic, Physical and Social Impacts*. London: Longman.

Miettinen, S. (2007) *Designing the Creative Tourism Experience: A Service Design Process with Namibian Crafts People.* Publication series of University of Art and Design Helsinki A 81. Jyväskylä: Gummerus kirjapaino Oy.

Minghetti, V. and Buhalis, D. (2010) Digital divide in tourism. *Journal of Travel Research* 49 (3), 267–281, doi:10.1177/0047287509346843.

Minnaert, L., Maitland, R. and Miller, G. (2011) What is social tourism? *Current Issues in Tourism* 14 (5), 403–415.

Moscardo, G. (2008) Community Capacity Building: An Emerging Challenge for Tourism Development, in G. Moscardo (ed.) Building Community Capacity for Tourism Development (pp. 1–16). Oxfordshire: CABI.

Müller, D.K. and Huuva, S.K. (2009) Limits to Sami tourism development: The case of Jokkmokk, Sweden. *Journal of Ecotourism* 8 (2), 115–127, doi:10.1080/14724040802696015.

Müller, D.K. and Pettersson, R. (2006) Sámi heritage at the winter festival in Jokkmokk, Sweden. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 6 (1), 54–69, doi:10.1080/15022250600560489.

Müller, D.K. and Viken, A. (2017) Indigenous tourism in the Arctic. In A. Viken and D.K. Müller (eds) *Tourism and Indigeneity in the Arctic* (pp. 3–15). Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Nicholas, L. and Thapa, B. (2018) Tourism in the Fond Gens Libre Indigenous community in Saint Lucia. Examining impacts and empowerment. In I.B. de Lima and V. King (eds) *Tourism and Ethnodevelopment. Inclusion, Empowerment and Self-determination* (pp. 246–259). Abingdon: Routledge.

Niskala, M. and Ridanpää, J. (2016) Ethnic representations and social exclusion: Sáminess in Finnish Lapland tourism promotion. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 16 (4), 375–394, doi:10.1080/15022250.2015.1108862.

NPA (Northern Periphery and Arctic Programme) (2018) Programme manual. See http://www.interreg-npa.eu/for-project-managers/programme-manual/ (accessed May 2019).

O'Gorman, K. (2010) *The Origins of Hospitality and Tourism*. Oxford: Goodfellow Publishers.

Prasetyo, N., Carr, A. and Filep, S. (2019) Indigenous knowledge in marine ecotourism development: The case of *Sasi Laut*, Misool, Indonesia. *Tourism Planning & Development* 17 (1), 46–61, doi:10.1080/21568316.2019.1604424.

Pyyhtinen, O. (2014) *The Gift and its Paradoxes. Beyond Mauss*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Rantala, K. and Sulkunen, P. (2006a) Esipuhe (Foreword). In K. Rantala and P. Sulkunen (eds) *Projektiyhteiskunnan kääntöpuolia* (*Downsides of Project-Society*) (pp. 7–14). Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Rantala, K. and Sulkunen, P. (2006b) Uudet hallintamekanismit – miksi ja miten? (New mechanism for management – how and why?) In K. Rantala and P. Sulkunen (eds) *Projektiyhteiskunnan kääntöpuolia* (*Downsides of Project-Society*) (pp. 15–16). Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Ren, C. and Jóhannesson, G.T. (2018) Collaborative becoming: Exploring Tourism Knowledge Collectives. In C. Ren, G.T. Jóhannesson and R. van der Duim (eds) *Co-creating Tourism Research: Towards Collaborative Ways of Knowing* (pp. 24–38). London: Routledge.

Ren, C., Jóhannesson, G.T. and van der Duim, R. (2018) Towards a collaborative manifesto: Configurations of Tourism knowledge co-creation. In C. Ren, G.T. Jóhannesson and R. van der Duim (eds) *Co-creating Tourism Research: Towards Collaborative Ways of Knowing* (pp. 179–183). London: Routledge.

Saarinen, J. (2006) Traditions of sustainability in tourism studies. *Annals of Tourism Research* 33 (4), 1121–1140.

Saarinen, J. (2010) Local tourism awareness: Community views in Katutura and King Nehale Conservancy, Namibia. *Development Southern Africa* 27 (5), 713–724.

Sámi Parliament (2018) Vastuullisen ja eettisesti kestävän saamelaismatkailun toimintaperiaatteet (Principles of responsible and ethically sustainable Sámi tourism). See https://dokumentit.solinum.fi/samediggi/?f=Dokumenttipankki%2FKertomukset%2C%20ohjelmat%20ja%20suunnitelmat (accessed May 2019).

Sammels, C.A. (2014) Bargaining under thatch roofs: Tourism and the allure of poverty in highland Bolivia. In D. Picard and M.A. Giovine (eds) *Tourism and the Power of Otherness. Seductions of Difference* (pp. 124–140). Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Scheyvens, R. (1999) Ecotourism and the empowerment of local communities. *Tourism Management* 20, 245–249, doi:10.1016/S0261-5177(98)00069-7.

Scheyvens, R. (2002) *Tourism for Development: Empowering Communities.* Harlow: Pearson Education.

Scheyvens, R. (2003) Local involvement in managing tourism. In T. Singh, J.T. Dallen and R.K. Dowling (eds) *Tourism in Destination Communities* (pp. 229–252). Wallingford: CABI Publishing.

Scheyvens, R. (2011) *Tourism and Poverty*. London: Routledge.

Scheyvens, R. and Biddulph, R. (2017). Inclusive tourism development. *Tourism Geographies* 20 (4), 589–609, doi:10.1080/14616688.2017.1381985.

Schilcher, D. (2007) Growth versus equity: The continuum of pro-poor tourism and neoliberal governance. In M. Hall (ed.) *Pro-poor Tourism: Who Benefits? Perspectives on Tourism and Poverty Reduction* (pp. 57–83). Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Smith, V.L. (ed.) (1977) *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Stiefel, M. and Wolfe, M. (1994) The many faces of participation. In A. Cornwall (ed.) *The Participation Reader*. London: Zed Books.

Sulkunen, P. (2006) Projektiyhteiskunta ja uusi yhteiskuntasopimus (Project society and the new societal contract). In K. Rantala and P. Sulkunen (eds) *Projektiyhteiskunnan kääntöpuolia* (*Downsides of Project-Society*) (pp. 17–38). Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Swarbrooke, J. (2002) *Sustainable Tourism Management*. Wallingford: CABI Publishing.

Tanga, P.T. and Maliehe, L. (2011) An analysis of community participation in handicraft projects in Lesotho. *Anthropologist* 13 (3), 201–210.

Telfer, D.J. (2009) Development studies and tourism. In T. Jamal and M. Robinson (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Tourism Studies* (pp. 504–520). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Telfer, D.J. and Sharpley, R. (eds) (2008) *Tourism and Development in the Developing World*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Telfer, E. (2000) The philosophy of hospitableness. In C. Lashley and A. Morrison (eds) *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates* (pp. 38–55). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Tosun, C. (2000) Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries. *Tourism Management* 21 (6), 613–633.

Tucker, H. (2014) Mind the gap: Opening up spaces of multiple moralities in tourism encounters. In M. Mostafanezhad and K. Hannam (eds) *Moral Encounters in Tourism* (pp. 199–208). Farnham: Ashgate.

Tuulentie, S. (2006) The dialectic of identities in the field of tourism. The discourses of the Indigenous Sámi in defining their own and the tourists' identities. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 6 (1), 25–36.

Tuulentie, S. and Sarkki, S. (2009) Kun kylästä tulee keskus (When village turns into tourism destination). In S. Tuulentie (ed.) *Turisti tulee kylään. Matkailukeskukset ja lappilainen arki* (*Tourists as Guests in Finnish Tourism Destinations*) (pp. 9–28). Helsinki: Minerva Kustannys Oy.

van der Duim, R., Peters, K. and Akama, J. (2006) Cultural tourism in African communities: A comparison between cultural Manyattas in Kenya and cultural tourism project in Tanzania. In

M.K. Smith and M. Robinson (eds) *Cultural Tourism in a Changing World. Politics, Participation and (Re)presentation*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Veijola, S. and Jokinen, E. (2008) Towards a hostessing society? Mobile arrangements of gender and labour. *NORA: Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research* 16 (3), 166– 181.

Veijola, S., Germann Molz, J., Pyyhtinen, O., Höckert, E. and Grit, A. (2014) *Disruptive Tourism and its Untidy Guests. Alternative Ontologies for Future Hospitalities*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Viken, A. and Müller, D.K. (2017) *Tourism and Indigeneity in the Arctic*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Warnholz, G. and Barkin, D. (2018) Development for whom? Tourism used as a social intervention for the development of indigenous/rural communities in natural protected areas. In I.B. de Lima and V. King (eds) *Tourism and Ethnodevelopment. Inclusion, Empowerment and Self-determination* (pp. 27–43). Abingdon: Routledge.

Wearing, S. and McDonald, M. (2002) The development of community-based tourism: Re-thinking the relationships between tour operators and development agents as intermediaries in rural and isolated area communities. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 10 (2), 31–45.

Wearing, S. and Wearing, M. (2014) On decommodifying ecotourism's social value: Neoliberal reformism or the new environmental morality?. In M. Mostafanezhad and K. Hannam (eds) *Moral Encounters in Tourism* (pp. 123–138). Farnham: Ashgate.

Zapata, M.J., Hall, C., Lindo, P. and Vanderschaeghe, M. (2011) Can community based tourism contribute to development and poverty alleviation? Lessons from Nicaragua. *Current Issues in Tourism* 14 (8), 725–749.